DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 105 010 UD 014 999

TITLE	North Carolina Annual Evaluation Report, Fiscal Year 1973; Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965--Title I.
INSTITUTION	North Carolina State Dept. of Public Instruction, Raleigh. Div. of Compensatory Education.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	35p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; Administrative Change; *Annual Reports; Educational Administration; Educational Change; Nonpublic School Aid; *Program Evaluation; Public Schools; School Districts; *State Surveys; Statistical Data; Student Enrollment
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; *North Carolina

ABSTRACT

This State of North Carolina annual evaluation report on programs, projects, services, and activities funded in whole or in part under Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I is organized in eight parts. Part 1, "Basic State Statistics," includes information concerning the total number of operating local educational agencies (LEA) in the state, the number of LEA's participating in Title I, the number of Title I projects, the unduplicated number of pupils who participated in Title I programs enrolled in public and in nonpublic schools, and, participants by type of activity. Part 2, "State Educational Agency (SEA) Title I Staff Visits," notes that these staff visits can be categorized by objectives as follows: planning, development, operation, evaluation, and other objectives. Part 3, "SEA Efforts to Affect Change," focuses on changes in the administration and monitoring of Title I projects and in project design and operations. Part 4 specifies "Effects on Educational Achievement" while Part 5 details "Effects on Administrative Structure." "Additional Efforts to Help Disadvantaged" is the topic of Part 6. Part 7 focuses on "Compensatory Education in Non-public Schools" while Part 8 discusses "Coordinated Teach-Teacher Aide Training." (JM)

ED105010

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 - Title I

North Carolina Annual Evaluation Report

Fiscal Year 1973

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared by
The Division of Compensatory Education
State Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, North Carolina
December, 1973

UD014999

A. Craig Phillips
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Jerome H. Melton
Assistant Superintendent for Program Services

George A. Kahdy
Deputy Assistant Superintendent for Program Services

Harold H. Webb
Special Assistant for Compensatory Education

William M. Hennis
Associate Director, Program Operations

NORTH CAROLINA ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR
FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1973
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 - TITLE I

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.	Basic State Statistics	1
2.	SEA Title I Staff Visits	2
3.	SEA Efforts to Affect Change	5
4.	Effects on Educational Achievement	7
5.	Effects on Administrative Structure	12
6.	Additional Efforts to Help Disadvantaged	15
7.	Compensatory Education in Non-Public Schools	21
8.	Coordinated Teacher-Teacher Aide Training	22

North Carolina Annual Evaluation Report for

Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1973

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 - Title I

1. Provide the following basic State statistics:
(Data secured from evaluation reports submitted by each LEA)

A. Total number of operating LEA's in the State.....152
B. Number of LEA's participating in Title I.....152
(1) during the regular school term only.....128
(2) during the summer term only.....0
(3) during both the regular school term and the summer term.....24
C. Number of Title I projects.....152
D. Unduplicated number of pupils who participated in Title I programs
(1) enrolled in public schools.....172,107
(2) enrolled in non-public schools.....936
E. Participants by type of activity

Activity or Service	Participants
Kindergarten	16,507*
Reading	118,097
Language Arts	30,415
Art	5,233
Cultural Enrichment	8,598
Mathematics	15,783
Music	9,858
Natural Science	1,315
Occupational Education	2,510
Physical Education	2,180
Social Sciences	390
Special Activities for the Handicapped	4,328
Other Instructional Activities	2,288
Attendance	32,813
Clothing	15,456
Food	13,168
Guidance Counseling	21,033
Health/Medical, Dental	68,703*
Media	29,775
Psychological	14,021
Social Work	51,393
Transportation	35,518
Special Services for the Handicapped	1,142
Other Services	13,760

* Duplicated count

2. During FY 1973, indicate the number of SEA Title I staff visits to LEAs participating in Title I. By objective of visit (planning, program development, program operation, evaluation, etc.), specify the purposes of these visits and their effect on the development, operation, and evaluation of local projects. Indicate proportion of visits, by type.

During FY 1973 a total of 16 State staff members made 782 visits to LEAs participating in Title I. Of the sixteen staff members, 10 were Title I, 3 were Migrant Education, 2 were Reading, and 1 was Early Childhood. Each LEA was visited at least one time, and most were visited two or more times during the year. These staff visits can be categorized by objectives as follows: (1) planning, (2) development, (3) operation, (4) evaluation, and (5) other.

Planning. Of the 782 staff visits, 97 or 12.4 percent were primarily devoted to assisting the LEA to plan effective projects. Through such visits the State staff assisted the local staff in such areas as identifying needs, defining objectives, determining appropriate activities, and selecting alternatives which offer greater promise of helping the target population.

In addition to these visits, the SEA staff conducted 6 area meetings as a means of assisting LEAs to plan project proposals. Many LEA project directors also visited the State office to secure help in planning.

Development. Of the 782 staff visits, 178 or 22.7 percent were primarily focused on program development. Through these visits the Title I staff assisted the LEAs to complete the planning process and to develop project proposals in a format which could be easily reviewed for approval. Also, in these visits the staff suggested new or alternative approaches to the solution of stated problems. Frequently, too, the staff member found it necessary to encourage the LEA to concentrate upon a limited number of activities rather than attempting to implement a large number of separate activities

From time to time the staff also found it necessary to reemphasize that Title I activities must focus upon specific student needs rather than upon general school needs.

Operation. Of the 782 staff visits, 461 or 59.1 percent were for the purpose of reviewing the operation of Title I project. Most often these visits consisted of on-site visits to view the various aspects of the project which were operating satisfactorily and those which were not. On the basis of such observations, recommendations for improvement were then made. Recommendations frequently made included the following: more inservice training for teachers, planned visitation of nearby Title I projects judged to be successful, more widespread dissemination of information gleaned from the project evaluation, a constant review of alternative ways of attacking educational problems, and careful consideration of the equipment and/or technique which might be utilized. It was generally recognized by both the LEA and the State staff that on-site visits were mutually beneficial.

Evaluation. Of the 782 staff visits, 38 or 4.8 percent were devoted to project evaluation. The major objective of these visits was to improve the evaluation procedure utilized by the LEA. The visit focused on the effective reporting of local evaluation materials, and the use of such materials in project planning and development. Based on comments from the State staff, these visits and the resulting frank appraisal often resulted in positive changes in project emphasis.

Other Visits. Of the 782 visits, 8 or approximately 1.0 percent did not easily fit into the four categories above.

In addition to individual staff visits described above, team visits were conducted in 24 school districts. The following procedure was developed and implemented for these visits:

1) Purposes for visits were defined as follows:
   a. to identify promising practices in compensatory education
   b. to render technical assistance
   c. to identify areas in which further technical assistance is needed
   d. to evaluate program administration and operation in keeping with legal requirements and project application
   e. to assess the educational value of project activities
   f. to identify resource people

2) Units selected for team visits were chosen on the following basis:
   a. the nature of the Title I project
   b. size of grant and size of unit
   c. geographical location

3) A guide and checklist was developed for On-site visits.

4) The schedule was arranged with the local units selected for visits.

5) Each unit and team member was provided with necessary information relative to team visits.

6) Team members were selected and assigned.

7) Orientation meeting was held for team members.

8) Pre-visit conferences were held with each local Title I staff to assist them in making preparation for the visit.

9) Visits were made to LEAs

A total of 109 individuals were involved in these on-site visits. Of this number thirteen were members of the Title I staff, two reading consultants, four kindergarten consultants, three educational media consultants, two mathematics consultants, three pupil personnel services consultants, one cultural arts consultant, four exceptional children consultants, one health consultant, twenty-six LEA directors, and forty-nine parents. A total of 217 man days were spent visiting the selected projects.

Each district monitored received a detailed report of findings related to its Title I program. Later a report summarizing the major findings of the 24 on-site visits was disseminated to each local educational agency in the State.

3. Describe any changes your agency has made in the last three years in its procedures and the effect of such changes to:
A. improve the quality of Title I projects
B. insure proper participation of non-public school children
C. modify local projects in the light of State and local evaluation

A. The following changes in the administration of Title I have been made which should improve the quality of Title I projects:

1) The early project submission procedure was continued for FY 1974. LEA submitted program descriptions and budget proposals for review, prior to April 15. Review committees composed of curriculum specialists read and reacted to these early proposals. The Division of Auditing and Accounting reviewed each proposed budget. Where revisions were required the LEAs were so notified. When the proposals were acceptable, the LEA was notified. The major result of the process was to extend the period of time that the State staff could work with the LEAs in project development. Previously, these efforts were often confined to the summer months. The new process shifted this effort to the spring. Although late funding prevented fiscal approval until just prior to the opening of school, LEA program components were judged acceptable 30-60 days earlier.

2) The monitoring of 24 LEAs by a team of specialists during school year 1972-73 improved the quality of the project proposal from each of the un[illegible]ited.

B. The local [illegible]irector was charged with the responsibility of contacting officia[illegible]blic schools in his district, explaining the Title I program, and encouraging participation to the extent permitted under regulations. Each of the LEAs which had non-public schools in its district included as part of its project proposal a response to the following statement:

Describe how educationally deprived children enrolled in private schools will be given genuine opportunities to participate in the Title I program on the basis of need as determined by the comprehensive assessment of the needs of all children in the eligible low-income areas. Show that the high priority needs of private school children residing in those areas will be met with services that are comparable in scope and quality to those provided to meet the high priority needs of public school children.

The State staff, as part of its responsibility, encouraged the LEA to extend services to eligible non-public schools, and to design cooperatively Title I activities for eligible non-public school children. However, the number of non-public school students who participated in the Title I program was small, since the State has only approximately 4.5 percent of its children enrolled in non-public schools. Also, because of the nature and purpose of some of the schools, they have little interest in participating.

C. The study of State and local Title I evaluation reports resulted in efforts by both the SEA and the LEAs to modify local projects. Some general outcomes included the following:

- increased effort to design activities to meet the most pressing needs of the eligible children
- greater effort to design programs which offer specific rather than general types of assistance
- greater use of prior evaluations in the planning of programs
- increased effort to coordinate Title I activities with overall school program

Because of the extremely wide range of needs of the Title I eligible children, some needs must be given priority over other needs. On the basis of what has been learned through the operation and evaluation of the Title I program thus far, the State staff has determined that the following activities should have the highest priority:

- lower elementary grade education
- developmental activities in basic skills
- parental involvement
- planning and evaluation

Likewise, the following activities should have the lowest priority:

- construction
- secondary school activities
- programs already substantially supported by federal, State, or local effort
- cultural activities in regular session for large groups of students

4. Effect Upon Educational Achievement

A. What effect, if any, has Title I had upon the educational achievement of educationally deprived children, including those children in non-public schools in your state:

Since each LEA designs, implements, and evaluates its own Title I program, it is difficult to generalize as to the success of Title I on a State-wide basis. No uniform program evaluation design is applied, and no single achievement test is administered State-wide. For these reasons the effect of Title I upon participants can best be seen through reviewing individual LEA evaluation studies. Some of these studies report minimal gains, some report modest gains, and some report substantial gains. From the studies reporting substantial gains in the area of reading achievement, the following excerpts have been selected as examples of the effect of Title I upon educationally deprived participants

ASHEVILLE CITY SCHOOLS

A. Name of Activity - Reading

B. Number of participants - 279

C. Approximate cost - $60,556

D. Description of identified needs

Tests administered to children in Grades 2-6 during the Title I summer program of FY 71 showed 264 children in eligible schools who were more than one year below their expected grade level in reading. This followed the same pattern as in previous years with the educa-

tional gap or deficiency becoming more acute as the children are passed from grade to grade.

Eligible children needed to improve their basic skills of reading with emphasis on comprehension and following directions. In addition, they needed a variety of experiences to promote social and emotional growth, cultural development, and to achieve a feeling of success.

There was also a need for attention to physical deficiencies - medical/dental and welfare - so that these factors do not continue to be a deterrent to the educational process.

E. Behavioral objectives

Students in the reading classes were expected to show six months to a year's progress in reading as measured by the Gates-MacGinnitie Reading Tests. They were also expected to show improved self-image and attitudes as measured by teacher observation.

F. Progress made toward stated objectives

The greatest achievement gain was attained by students in Grades 2-7 where there was measured progress of at least one year. Based on the composite scores of word recognition and comprehension on the Gates-MacGinnitie Tests.

Social and emotional growth cannot be measured by tests, but observations of the classroom teachers noted there were attitude changes and more interest in school work.

G. Modifications planned in the structure of the activity or service

The basic structure will be unchanged. Continuous efforts will be expended in finding more and better ways for working with the special needs of eligible children.

CABARRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS

A. Name of activity - Reading

B. Number of participants - 637
(Grade 1-221, Grade 2-227, Grade 3-189)

C. Approximate cost - $131,000

D. Description of identified needs

Seven special reading teachers were placed in Title I schools that had the highest concentration of educational deprivation (reading) in the first three grades. Each special reading teacher was given the assistance of a full time aide. Using special remedial reading material, each team (teacher and aide) worked with approximately 40 children in groups of 10 children. Children chosen for these groups showed a deficiency of 8 months or more in reading on the appropriate level of Houghton-Mifflin reading test.

Aides were assigned to visit the homes of Title I children. The social aide served as a communicator between the home and the school. She investigated causes of absences and suggested channels of assistance through community agencies. She made consistent efforts to report educational progress of Title I pupils.

E. Behavioral objectives

Given individualized attention, special teaching materials, and positive relationships, Title I children in Cabarrus County will increase their total reading skills by at least nine months as measured by pre and post tests of the appropriate level of Houghton-Mifflin Reading Test.

F. Progress made toward stated objectives

Using Houghton-Mifflin Reading Tests of the appropriate level as a pre-test, 637 pupils in grades 1-3 were found to be three months or more

below national median scores in reading. These children were assigned to the Title I special reading teacher or teaching aides for concentrated remedial work in reading. The same pupils were re-tested in May using a different form of the same test. The May test results show a mean gain of 1.1 years for the entire group of 637 Title I children.

G. Modifications planned in the structure of the activity or service

No major modifications are planned in the structure of the activity in FY 74.

EDGECOMBE COUNTY SCHOOLS

A. Name of activity - Special Reading

B. Number of participants - 473

Grade	2 - 52	5 - 91	8 - 20
	3 - 61	6 - 64	
	4 - 155	7 - 30	

Grade 1 was not included because those pupils were served by a separate Tutorial Reading Program.

C. Approximate cost - $275,000.

D. Description of identified needs

A high percentage of children in Edgecombe County come from an economically, socially, and educationally deprived environment. Reading deficiencies are apparent on all levels. These needs have been determined by testing, parental surveys, professional judgment, and suggestions from social agencies. Priority for special reading was given to pupils at or below the 35th percentile in the area of reading, as determined by a standardized reading test.

Nine reading labs were set up, one in each of nine schools, with one full-time reading teacher and one full-time paraprofessional. Equip-

ment and material varied according to the organizational plan of the particular school. Both commercial, teacher and pupil prepared materials were used.

The Fountain Valley Teacher Support System, a diagnostic reading test, enabled reading teachers to diagnose individual skill deficiencies quickly. Each pupil's skill level and problem area were identified, individual behavioral objectives were set, suitable programs were prescribed immediately. Post-tests were given for each objective, reinforcement provided if necessary, or new objectives set up, and new prescriptions made and completed. This allowed a continuous test, teach, re-test, teach process. Pupils went to the reading labs 5 days a week, for one hour periods.

E. Behavioral objectives

The main behavioral objective was to increase the reading grade level by one month for every month in the reading lab for 75% of the children in the special reading classes. This was to be done by providing a sequential instructional remedial program for each child on his reading level, by teaching and reinforcing the needed skills, by stressing comprehension as an important part of reading, by providing successful experiences in reading through the use of high-interest, low reading level materials, by stressing the concept of reading for pleasure. Instruction was provided on an individual basis generally, in small or large groups as the occasion arose, with opportunities for independent reading for pleasure being provided. Library centers were maintained in each of the labs and pupils were allowed to take books home with them.

F. Progress made toward stated objectives

The California Reading Achievement Test was used as a pre- and post-test at the end of a six-month period in the reading lab. Individual gains over the six-month period ranged from 0 months to 43, with an average gain of 9 months. A total of 473 children participated.

G. Modifications planned in the structure of the activity or service

Evaluations of the special reading programs, with suggestions for modification, were requested from each pupil in the labs, reading teachers, classroom teachers, parents, and principals. Comments generally were very favorable, especially those from the children.

No great changes are being planned in the special reading program. The labs will be operated on basically the same plans. Regular classroom teachers will be more involved, through orientation into the objectives and procedures used in the labs, and through more conferences concerning their pupils in the reading lab. The extra work days provided by the last legislature will allow time for that which has not been available in the past.

5. What effect, if any, has the Title I program had on the administrative structure and educational practices of the State agency, local educational agencies, and non-public schools?

Early in 1971 the State agency involved itself in a management study of the entire operation of the State Department of Public Instruction. During this process an analysis was made of the organizational structure of the Department. Following the management study, the Title I, ESEA operation, including Migrant Education, was organized into a Division of Compensatory Education.

The Compensatory Education staff was reorganized to include one Associate Director for Administrative Operations, one Associate Director

for Program Operations, and one Associate Director for Migrant Operations. Six area supervisors work directly with the LEAs to improve planning, operation, and evaluation of Title I projects. In three geographic areas where the State agency has established regional offices, these supervisors, although not physically located in these area offices, coordinate their efforts with the area offices.

One consultant from each academic discipline has been assigned by the Assistant Superintendent for Program Services to serve the specific needs of Compensatory Education programs. These disciplines include cultural arts; health, safety, and physical education; language arts; reading; mathematics; occupational education; science; social studies; exceptional children; and early childhood education. These consultants have two lines of responsibility; first, to the Director of a particular discipline, and, secondly, to the Director of Compensatory Education. A similar cooperative arrangement operates between the Division of Compensatory Education and the Division of Pupil Personnel Services.

As a result of this reorganization at the State level, many local educational agencies are now following the same pattern of organization and what was formerly a Director of Title I, ESEA is now called the Director of Compensatory Education.

Coordination with other State agencies in State government has been effective, as evidenced by close working relationships with the Department of Human Resources and the Department of Social Rehabilitation and Control in programs related to mental health, social services, health, and neglected and delinquent students. In four cities in North Carolina - Asheville, High Point, Charlotte and Winston-Salem - the Division of Compensatory Education has established a working relationship with the Model Cities program. The

division is also assisting with the cooperation between the Model Cities personnel and the local educational agency personnel in those four cities.

At the inception of the Title I, ESEA program, many local educational agencies did not have a systematic approach to educational planning. However, with the requirement for comprehensive planning being a part of the Title I program, each district moved in this direction. Now that the State agency is promoting comprehensive planning for the basic program, more than two-thirds of the local educational agencies are currently involved in specific programs of planning for the improvement of their total educational program. Furthermore, Title I, ESEA practices have made both State and local school administrators aware of the necessity of including teachers, paraprofessionals, and lay citizens in the planning of educational programs.

Another aspect of the State Title I program is worthy of note. The Division of Research has under way a statewide assessment program at selected grade levels. A specific component of this assessment program is designed to provide a status measure of Title I students in the areas of reading, language development and mathematics. The results of this annual assessment program will give some measure of direction to the administration of Title I programs, as well as direction to the State basic program.

The State of North Carolina has a rather small number of students enrolled in qualifying non-public schools which participate in the Title I, ESEA program. Nevertheless, local educational agencies have identified non-public schools operating in their school districts and have included these officials in the planning, development, and implementation of Title I activities to serve eligible students. As a result of this involvement, officials of the non-public schools are more aware of the educational programs in the public schools.

6. Additional efforts to Help the Disadvantaged

A. If state funds have been used to augment Title I programs, describe the number of projects, objectives of the programs, rationale for increased funding with State money, and the amount and proportion of total program funds provided by the State for the 1972-73 school year.

Although there have been no programs funded by the State that are specifically and solely for disadvantaged children, some programs tend to serve the same target population as Title I. For example, in 1971-72 a pilot kindergarten program in 74 LEAs funded by the State served approximately 3,400 students. In 1973-74, this pilot program will be expanded to provide a minimum of 2 kindergarten classes in each of the State's school districts. About 16 percent of the State's five year old children are expected to be enrolled in the program in 1973-74. By September, 1978 it is expected that all five year old children will be enrolled. Until that time, the following procedures have been established to assure that this State program serves Title I eligible students as well as non-Title I eligible students:

(a) Local Educational Agencies with their entire district qualifying as a Title I project area may locate the State-supported kindergarten classes anywhere in the district provided the children who are deemed to be eligible for Title I services will have equal access with other children in the attendance area to be served by those classes.

(b) Local Educational Agencies with Title I project areas and non-Title I project areas must:

(1) Determine the number of five-year-old children residing in the Title I project and non-project areas.

(2) Locate State-supported kindergarten class spaces for five-year-old children in Title I project areas in the same proportion as such children bears to the total number of five-year-old children in the applicant's district. Thus, if 161 spaces (i.e., 7 classes with 23 children each) are to be provided with State-support in

a district with 1000 five-year-olds, the applicant would then determine how many spaces to the nearest class unit should be located in the applicant's Title I project area. If 600 of the 1000 five-year-olds live in eligible areas, then 60% of the 161 spaces or 96 spaces rounded to an even 4 classes (4 x 23 = 92) would have to be provided in the Title I project area. All children in such areas would, of course, have equal access to such State-supported kindergartens.

After the children have been selected to participate in State-supported programs, Title I funds may then be used to provide kindergarten programs for those Title I eligible children in project areas who are unable to be included in the selection of children in the State-funded kindergarten.

B. Provide descriptions of outstanding examples of the coordination of Title I activities with those of other federally funded programs. Identify the other programs and agencies involved.

Each LEA is required to include in its project proposal and in its yearly evaluation report a description of efforts to coordinate Title I activities with those of other federally funded programs. The SEA, in its review of project proposals, analyzes programs with a view toward determining those activities which possibly could be supported in whole or in part by funds from sources other than Title I.

Examples of activities which involved a coordinated effort between Title I and other federally funded programs are given below:

HAYWOOD COUNTY SCHOOLS

Haywood County participated in the following programs funded totally or in part with federal monies during FY 1973. In some cases this unit was the applicant agency; in other cases, Haywood County was one of several counties who participated cooperatively.

Title I Regular - Educationally Disadvantaged
Title I Carryover 1972 - Educationally Disadvantaged
Title I Migrant - Regular year and summer programs
Title II - Library Books and AV Materials

Title II - Seven County Project Media - Film Co-op
Title VI - Day Camp for Mentally Retarded - WCU
Title VI - Mobile Speech and Hearing Unit operated among several western counties
NDEA - Equipment and Non-consumable Instructional Supplies
Head Start - Year-round pre-school activities for meeting special needs of children
VEA - Vocational Equipment, Materials, and Personnel
Mountain Projects, Incorporated - CAA for a variety of projects, some of which are related tc school programs
Department of Social Services
Haywood County Health Department
Neighborhood Youth Corps - In-school and out-of-school employment program for disadvantaged
School Food Service - Lunch and Breakfast programs
Title III - A preventive approach to reading difficulty in the primary grades - grant awarded to Haywood County
State of Franklin Child Day Care Centers - Funded with Appalachian money
Title III - Environmental Education - cooperative project
Title VI - Special Education Instructional Materials Center
"Help Communities Help Themselves" - Drug abuse training grant
Volunteers in Reading - EPDA Training Grant
Teacher Corps - Cycle Seven
Right-to-Read Site - no funds involved
V-TAP - Visitor-Technical Assistance program

A majority of the programs listed above place high priority on the educationally and economically disadvantaged child and/or his family. Since goals and aims are similar in many instances, Haywood County attempts to administer all programs in such a way as to obtain maximum benefit from all and to maintain the integrity of each.

In addition, an effort is made to make these programs mutually supportive, thus enabling maximum return for funds expended. Consequently, a Title I child may be in a Title I class using NDEA purchased equipment, screened by the mobile speech and hearing unit, provided materials under Title I and Title II, and provided continuing experiences in the Summer Migrant project.

Specific examples follow of the type of coordination between these programs which is evident in Haywood County.

1. The Title III preventive approach to the problems of reading difficulties in grades 1-3 is permitting Title I to concentrate in grades 4-8.

2. V-TAP program provided in-service activities for Title I personnel.

3. All Title I and Migrant children needing free lunches are provided free meals through the School Food Service program.

4. Purchase of testing materials under the State Title III program permitted the establishment of a uniform evaluation program for all Title I participants.

5. Title I teachers and aides make regular use of the materials and services provided by the Title VI SEIMC.

Every attempt is made to provide a total program approach to the needs of Title I children while, at the same time, adhering to the guidelines within which each program must operate. Since funds are generally not adequate to operate a program independently, it become imperative that interdependence among programs be assured. In this fashion the cost squeeze which is experienced in every activity can be somewhat ameliorated.

PAMLICO COUNTY SCHOOLS

The ESEA project was coordinated with the Emergency School Assistance Act. This program made it possible to expand the ESEA tutorial program services and provide a comprehensive program in the primary grades through the use of teachers and teacher-aides for reading to improve student reading performance. The ESAA project also supplemented the Title I project by providing parent workshops on their role in the reading development of their children.

The project was coordinated with the Pamlico County Health Department. Through the North Carolina Commission for the Blind and the County Health Department, ESEA students received eye glasses. The Health Department held a pre-school clinic for the Title I kindergarten children. The ESEA dental program was coordinated through the Craven-Pamlico Health Departments' mobile

dental unit and Title I students received dental services. Students were referred to the Neuse Mental Health Clinic for psychological evaluations.

Title I students participated in the National-Federal lunch program. All students in need received a free or reduced price lunch.

Many of the educationally deprived children in the project who are from low income families received benefits from the Social Services Department.

ROBESON COUNTY SCHOOLS

A careful and continuing effort is made to coordinate Title I activities with other federally funded programs and with other agencies whose budget and programs are contributed to in part by federal funds. This is done to insure advantageous use of existing services and to prevent duplicating or supplanting services and activities.

A. Through periodic meetings and conferences, the Title I Health Service was coordinated with the County Public Health Department in order that there be a clarification of the services and activities of each, and to avoid conflict of responsibilities in the public schools. A representative of the Public Health Department is a member of the Title I Advisory Committee.

B. The Title I home-school coordinators have coordinated services with the Social Service Agency.

C. Title I and Title VI were coordinated in that the services of a Supervisor of Special Education (who works in four school units in Robeson County) was available to the six Title I special education classes.

D. Title II and NDEA complemented and supplemented Title I through making educational media supplies and materials available. Title I

activities were coordinated with the County Educational Resource Center, a former Title III project.

E. Title I coordinated with the Migrant Education Program, a separately funded Title I program, to assure that there was no duplication of program or services. The Migrant Advisory Committee met jointly with the Title I Advisory Committee on several occasions.

F. The Title I kindergarten snack program was coordinated with the National School Lunch Program and the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

G. A non-LEA federal grant program is operational in the county, serving a group of educationally deprived students and parents. Close coordination between the recipient agency and the LEA is maintained to prevent duplication of services.

H. A cooperative project of Robeson County's six school administrative units, funded through federal and state funds, has been in operation for the past year and a half. This program is designed to give skills in obtaining and holding jobs to disadvantaged vocational students enrolled in the high schools of the county. Where applicable, the students in the Title I occupational classes were included for counseling and job placement.

I. There was further coordination of Title I with other programs, not federally funded:

   1. The Title I Pre-School Program was coordinated with a State Demonstration Kindergarten, allotted in FY 72.
   2. The Title I occupational education classes in three project schools had available the services of the Director of Occupational Education for the Robeson County Administrative Unit.

3. Title I Health Service was coordinated with a state-funded Dental Health Program in the county school system.

4. Title I personnel worked with the Robeson County Church and Community Agency, which provides guidance and counseling.

7. Evaluate the success of Title I in bringing compensatory education to children enrolled in non-public schools. Include in your evaluation such factors as the number of projects, the quality of projects, the time of day and/or year when projects are offered, the adaptations to meet the specific educational needs of educationally deprived children in non-public schools, changes in legal interpretation, and joint planning with non-public school officials.

The State Title I staff charged local Title I directors with the responsibility of contacting officials of non-public schools in their administrative units, interpreting the Title I program to them and encouraging them to participate in the Title I program to the extent permitted under Federal Regulations.

A local educational agency which had non-public schools in its unit included as a part of its project proposal a response to the statement:

> "Educationally deprived children enrolled in private schools will have a genuine opportunity to participate in the Title I program on the basis of need as determined by the comprehensive assessment of the needs of all children in the eligible low-income areas. The high priority needs of private school children residing in those areas will be met with services that are comparable in scope and quality to those provided to meet the high priority needs of public school children."

In making provisions for eligible non-public school children to participate in Title I programs, directors and superintendents held conferences with officials of non-public schools, made telephone calls, and wrote letters to them informing them of the services available to their children through Title I programs.

As a part of its responsibility, the State Title I staff encourages the LEA to extend services to eligible non-public school children. However, the number of non-public school students who participated in the Title I program was relatively small due to the following:

1) The state has a relatively small number of children enrolled in such schools - 54,000 compared to 1,200,000 in public schools.

2) The non-public schools have a very small number of children eligible to receive Title I services.

8. How many LEAs conducted coordinated teacher-teacher aide training programs for education aides and professional staff members they assist? What was the total number of participants in each project? Describe the general patterns of activities and provide specific examples of outstanding joint training programs.

Fifty-six LEAs provided one or more coordinated inservice programs for teachers and aides during FY 73 according to data in the Evaluation Reports submitted to the State Title I office. Participating in the coordinated inservice programs were 1,229 teachers, 1,318 aides, 121 administrators, 72 supervisors, and 104 others. Twenty-two other LEAs reported inservice programs that were limited to teachers or aides. Participants in the inservice programs of these LEAs were not included in the above count. A total of 27 aides, 230 teachers, and 35 others participated in these programs.

Activities reported by the LEAs in their coordinated inservice programs were quite varied. A significant number held orientation sessions in which teachers and aides met jointly to study the project and to plan for its implementation. Other districts held meetings during the year in which teachers, aides, and supervisors met to search for solutions to commonly encountered problems.

LEAs reported inservice work in these areas:

1. Reading
2. Individualizing Instruction
3. Early Childhood Education
4. Instructional Materials and Media
5. Learning disabilities
6. Games and teaching reading
7. Child growth and development
8. Diagnostic procedures

Most LEAs utilized their own personnel for inservice programs. Many used consultants from universities, the State Department of Public Instruction, and commercial firms. Several examples of inservice activities follow.

GUILFORD COUNTY SCHOOLS

An intensive program of inservice education was planned and implemented during the year. The project supervisor organized and coordinated courses of study for teachers and aides. These courses consisted of sixteen (16) class contact hours and offered certified personnel one (1) hour of renewal credit. Instructors from the University of North Carolina-Greensboro, Appalachian State University, Duke University, and University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill conducted the classes. Participation in these classes was excellent and evaluations of them were very good.

Other shorter workshop-type sessions were directed by the project director and the supervisor throughout the year. These workshops were open to all personnel employed by the project.

In addition, the reading teachers had the opportunity to visit several reading centers in an adjoining county. The teachers expressed great appreciation for this opportunity, stating that they had learned more from the visitation than from all other previous inservice experiences. Improvements and innovations were noted in many centers following these visits.

Personnel from the State Department of Public Instruction also visited both reading and kindergarten centers during the year and offered good suggestions for their improvement.

Some teachers were enrolled in courses at colleges in the area during the year. At least one teacher also took college course work during the summer.

ONSLOW COUNTY SCHOOLS

(a) Reading Laboratory Inservice Training

The teachers and aides involved in the Reading Laboratory Workshop received training together for five days prior to the opening of school. This workshop was generally concerned with effective utilization of aides, reading techniques, instructional materials and media to be used, and diagnosing and treating individual reading problems. Participants were as follows:

Supervisor (Title I)	1
Teachers	15
Aides	15

(b) Tutorial Aides Inservice

A training session for all tutorial aides was held for five days prior to the opening of school (Aug. 7-11). Demonstrations, lectures, and role playing were utilized in order to familiarize the aides in the proper procedures of tutoring. A breakdown of participants are as follows:

Supervisor (Title I)	1
Tutorial Aides	32

In addition to the above mentioned workshops a total of four and one half days was spent with commercial consultants during the year. All reading teachers and Title I supervisor participated in these workshops. Also all reading teachers met periodically for three (3) hour sessions with the Title I supervisor to go over procedures and techniques.

WAKE COUNTY SCHOOLS

Inservice for Title I teachers and aides last year included two workshops of six (6) hours, one held in the fall and one in the spring. The topic of the

fall workshop was "Orientation of the Hoffman Reading System". Seventeen (17) aides and seventeen (17) teachers attended.

The topic of the second workshop held April 14 at Zebulon Elementary was "Refining Techniques of the Hoffman Reading System". It was attended by seventeen aides and seventeen teachers and was designed to give the participants in-depth techniques in using the Hoffman Reading System.

In March, a course was offered from East Carolina University by the Division of Continuing Education. This course was entitled "Phonics in Reading and Spelling" and offered 2 semester hours or 3 quarter hours toward reading certification. Ten Title I teachers participated. On April 5 and 6, one consultant and three teachers attended the Secondary Reading Conference where they studied organization and implementation of reading in the content area.

Twelve Title I teachers attended the International Reading Association Conference on March 16 and 17 in Durham, North Carolina.

A twelve hour workshop called "The Dynamics of the Open Classroom" was held March 30-31 at Duke University. It was concerned with the attitudinal climate of the open classroom and was attended by the Title I consultant. One reading teacher participated in a weekend course offered by University Institutes in Durham. This institute was concerned with teaching the child with Learning Disabilities.

9. Describe the nature and extent of community and parent involvement in your Title I project. If you have a Title I Advisory Committee, briefly describe contributions made by the group. Indicate also the make-up or composition of your Advisory Committee.

The primary goal for the participation of parents in Title I program activities in North Carolina is to build the capabilities of parents to work with the school in a way which supports their children's well-being, growth, and development.

A review of the 1971 evaluation reports submitted by LEAs to the SEA indicates that parents and the community were involved in many aspects of Title I activities.

SOME EXAMPLES OF PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT FOLLOW:

ORANGE COUNTY SCHOOLS

Parents were encouraged to and did participate in the Title I activities through consultations, interviews, visits to the school, the Parent-Teacher Organization, the Advisory Council, attending field trips, entertaining at picnics and even arranging field trips. While parents visited the school daily they were particularly active during special seasons of the year such as Thanksgiving, Christmas, Valentines, and Easter. Quite often they provided teachers with materials for projects such as empty plastic containers, yarn, cloth, wall paper scraps, yarn spools, etc. Items of this nature can be useful to a kindergarten program but cannot be purchased on contracts. At open house parents were invited to spend the day visiting their child's classroom and to participate in class activites. Many were amazed at the variety of activities and experiences their children received at the kindergarten level.

Parents and interested citizens of the community provided almost 3000 Easter eggs for the Easter egg roll. Attendance at the Graduation Day exercises was in excess of 800 persons.

The largest effort of community and parent involvement for the school's benefit came in the spring. Parents under the leadership and organization of a very effective Parent Teacher Organization Chairman constructed several pieces of playground equipment designed especially to meet the physical needs of a five-year-old. Items such as a multi-level catwalk, spool playhouses and a natural hillside sliding board added tremendously to the equipment

purchased or donated by the Orange County Board of Education. Parents utilized several Saturdays to complete the volunteer architect's plans.

Almost all of the materials required for the completion of the project were donated by parents and businessmen in the community. Parents who were unable to volunteer their services contributed a substantial amount of money for the purchase of necessary materials and labor.

Before the playground was completed, it was not only a parent-community project but an inter-school effort. Student laborers from the Vocational Department of Orange High School and their instructor helped put the final touches on the newly constructed playground.

VANCE COUNTY SCHOOLS

Parental involvement and community involvement displayed by parents and friends as related to Title I programs have been tremendous. Parents from the communities of kindergarten and reading programs organized groups individually in elementary schools and Oak Grove Early Childhood Center. Each parent group came together once a month and held a joint meeting as well as an individual group meeting once a month at the various schools. Joint meetings were held each month at a different school to allow all parents to participate in programs planned and carried out by parents. Contributions made by the parent councils and friends were "really great". Some of the projects carried out by parent groups were that they purchased playground equipment, replaced worn carpeting, furnished pigeon holes for those classes which did not have them, painted worn furniture, made curtains or draperies for the offices and parent room at Oak Grove Early Childhood Center, purchased "lazy pillows", participated in field trips, gave seasonal parties or held individual birthday parties, contributed personal time helping small

groups with wood craft, art, music, and dance, relieved teachers and paraprofessionals with groups during the testing program, served as office helpers, assisted the school nurse whenever she requested help, and contributed items to classes voluntarily.

Approximately one hundred sixty-two (162) parents comprised the total number of parents actually involved in parent groups. Of these one hundred sixty-two parents, approximately 54% were black and 46% white. Each parent group organized with two co-chairmen--1 black and 1 white, a secretary, an assistant secretary, a treasurer, a media reporter, and various other committees. All officers and committee groups worked diligently together. Each parent group established certain goals to accomplish for the year and these goals were accomplished. The joint council or advisory committee likewise set forth certain goals for the 1972-73 school year. These goals were also accomplished.

The advisory committee functioned with all sincerity and made decisions based upon the needs of this area. Their decisions on the types of programs and the maneuvering of the programs proved to be decisions that promoted the instructional program in Vance County.

ROWAN COUNTY SCHOOLS

Rowan County Title I feels that whatever type of parental involvement exists, the end result should be furthering the educational opportunities and achievement of the children. This is possible because parents have such an in-depth and long-term knowledge of their children--their strengths and weaknesses, their needs, and their problems. The exchange of such information with trained professionals can help educators in planning a better, more relevant, school program.

There is a subsidiary asset of parental involvement, one which deals with the age-old problem of motivation. As children see their own parents more involved in school affairs, they will be encouraged to take a more active interest in school. They will have less opportunity for playing home against school and vice-versa.

The goals for the Rowan County Advisory Council were:

1. To assist the schools in identifying the educational needs of disadvantaged children.
2. To assist in developing Title I programs to meet the most pressing identified needs of educationally deprived children.
3. To be involved in evaluating the effectiveness of the program in meeting the needs of disadvantaged children.
4. To communicate information about the school program to target-area communities.
5. To act as a sounding board through which neighborhood residents can bring their concerns to the attention of school administrators and propose changes in the school program.
6. To assist in providing parents with an opportunity to organize their involvement in order to develop talents and hidden potentials of parents.
7. To establish better communication between parents and school personnel.
8. To involve parents as planners of policies and curriculum.

Many parents have realized their responsibility in the education of their children through working with the Title I program and some actually were employed through its funds.

A reading program and a kindergarten program were put into operation last fall with Title I funds. Children have advanced with the average gain being eight and a half months in reading. The primary children advanced more than the upper grade children; therefore, we are more and more trying to reach those deprived children as early in their school life as we possibly can, through our two new kindergarten programs this past year, and our proposed expanded kindergarten program.

Several parents took time at home to help or give encouragement to their children due to involvement with Title I whereas previously they had not realized this help was such a vital part or boost to their child's success in school.

Interest and appreciation were expanded by school personnel throughout the qualifying schools and these programs were well received in the communities, especially by parents.

Another concern of parents in the Rowan County Title I district was that of disappearing federal support in programs such as Title I for the disadvantage portion of our population. Our advisory council and communities went on record as to writing letters to Congressmen from N. C. asking for their support in keeping the federal program already in existence. Many replies were sent to our parents, thanking them for their interest, and many congressmen pledged to do all they could to see that these programs were continued.

Our community was informed and advised through our advisory council about the cutbacks in funds on Title I. Through the cutbacks, a whole new look at our Title I program was made. It was decided then, that with the cutbacks in federal funds that we should spend our efforts on preventing

failures before they had a chance to grow and multiply. Consequently our program with limited funds will be geared toward early childhood education (K-3) next year. Our community has been thoroughly informed and had a chance to participate in the decisions.

The Title I director has spoken to a Parent-Teacher Association and answered questions concerning the change in program with Title I funds. The community was also informed through the news media by way of newspapers and radio.

Parents of these disadvantaged children were invited and encouraged to come to school, eat in the lunchroom, and also observe their children at work. We feel the parents will both learn and benefit as well as help us understand their child better.

Conferences on an individual basis were arranged with the teachers or guidance counselors at the convenience of the parent to exchange specific information about their child.

All evaluations of the Title I programs as well as copies of our proposals were opened for review by our advisory council and community. It remains open for their inspection anytime.

The Rowan County Title I feels the advisory council and community have participated and contributed greatly in its program this year.